REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on June 27, 2007. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5 and 8-15 under 35 USC § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,928,363 by Ruvolo. Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4 and 16 under 35 USC § 103(a) over Ruvolo and De la Huerga.

The amended claims contain no new matter and Claims 1, 3-5, 8-16 are pending after entry of the present.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a)

After entry of the present Amendment, Applicants contend that Ruvolo fails to teach all elements of Applicants' claimed invention. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 10 to include a further clarification that the executing services of the active session are configured to continue execution when said user is disconnected. Support for this amendment can be found in the as-filed application on page 20, lines 12-14.

As amended, Applicants' executing services of the active session continue execution when said user is disconnected. Ruvolo fails to teach this element, and in fact teaches something entirely different when pausing or suspending a session. Particularly, Ruvolo states "However, since it is desired that the user at the client processor pace the session, the pause remains in place until terminated by the user." (column 7, lines 48-51). Where Applicants claim allowing executing services to continue execution when said user is disconnected, Ruvolo explicitly states that pause remains in place until terminated by the user and that the *user paces the session.*

While Ruvolo does not explicitly state how a user paces the session, in column 6, lines 7-18, Ruvolo discusses how transactions between a client and a server can cover many

transactions and where new transactions are sent every time the client wishes to engage the server. Similarly, in column 7, lines 19-23 Ruvolo states that after a client requests a document and the server fulfills the request, both sides then end the conversation. Ruvolo further elaborates in column 7, lines 23-25 that, "Thus, if a browser needed to get several documents from the same sever, the browser would initiate a separate request for each document." Thus, Applicants contend that with Ruvolo, the server cannot fulfill transactions when paused or suspended because transactions requests from the client cannot be sent as new transactions are sent every time the client wishes to engage the server. Furthermore, when a Ruvolo user suspends or pauses a session, the Ruvolo server must be waiting to fulfill transaction requests from the client since after the server fulfills a request, both sides end the conversation. This is entirely different than Applicants claimed invention where the executing services of an active session can continue executing when a user is disconnected. Because Ruvolo teaches something entirely different, particularly, not allowing executing service to continue execution when a user is disconnected, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection for claims 1, 5, and 8-13.

Furthermore, Applicants request withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection for claims 3, 4, and 16. Claims 3, 4 and 16 were rejected based on Ruvolo in view of de la Huerga, and de la Huerga fails to cure the previously discussed deficiencies of Ruvolo. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6911. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No SUNMP554). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

Konrad K. Chan, Esq.
Reg. No. 57,857

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6911
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer No. 32291